

REMARKS

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the Application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 3-4, 8, 12, 14-15, and 20-21 are amended, claims 5-7, 13, and 22 are canceled, and claims 27-31 are added. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by Applicant to advance prosecution of the Application and obtain allowance of the pending claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification (e.g., paragraphs 36-43 of the published Application), figures, and claims and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 14-21, and 23-31 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji et al. (USP 6,344,652) in view of Frederick et al. (USP 5,796,109). The Examiner next rejected claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji et al. and Frederick et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0181659). Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji et al. and Frederick et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. ('490) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Jeromin et al. (USP 5,661,309). Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji et al. and Frederick et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Endo et al. (USP 5,965,872). Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. in view of Watanabe et al. ('490). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. and Watanabe et al. ('490) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al. ('659). Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. and Watanabe et al. ('490) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Jeromin et al. Claims 20-22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick et al. in view of Watanabe

et al. ('490). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. ('490) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Jeromin et al. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick et al. in view of Watanabe et al. ('490) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al. ('659). These rejections are respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to the applied references, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Examiner's citations to the applied references is proper, do not teach or suggest one or more elements of the claimed invention, as further discussed below. In discussing the Examiner's citations to the applied references herein, Applicant does not acquiesce in the modification or combination of the Examiner's citations to the applied references.

For explanatory purposes, Applicant discusses herein one or more differences between the Examiner's citations to the applied references and the claimed invention with reference to one or more parts of the applied references. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Examiner's citations to the applied references correspond to the claimed invention.

As recited in Applicant's independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to the applied references do not teach or suggest one or more elements of the claimed invention. A careful reading of the Examiner's citations to the applied references fails to set forth a sustainable basis that the references teach or suggest, for example, one or more bumpers formed of the viscoelastic impact-absorbing material and substantially confined to respective identified prospective impact corners of an external perimeter of the cover assembly.

As recited in Applicant's independent claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to the applied references do not teach or suggest one or more elements of the claimed invention. A careful reading of the Examiner's citations to the applied references fails to set forth a sustainable basis that the references teach or suggest, for example, viscoelastic material secured to the housing and located in the one

or more discrete cavities substantially confined to respective identified prospective impact corners of a periphery of the housing.

As recited in Applicant's independent claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to the applied references do not teach or suggest one or more elements of the claimed invention. A careful reading of the Examiner's citations to the applied references fails to set forth a sustainable basis that the references teach or suggest, for example, viscoelastic impact-absorbing material that comprises a first impact-absorbing material portion disposed in the at least one substantially transverse cavity, the viscoelastic impact-absorbing material different from that which the top support panel and the bottom support panel are formed; at least one corner cavity substantially confined to a respective corner of the at least one of the top support panel and the bottom support panel; and a second impact-absorbing material portion of the viscoelastic impact-absorbing material disposed in the at least one corner cavity.

Of the applied references, the Examiner proposes that the citations to Watanabe et al. ('490) and the citations to Jeromin et al. disclose, *inter alia*, viscoelastic impact-absorbing material. Watanabe et al. ('490) disclose, for example, casing 91 located entirely around a perimeter, or relatively high in hardness shock absorbers 51 on the corner. Jeromin et al. disclose, for example, member 25 that extends outside a corner. The Examiner's citations to Watanabe et al. ('490) and Jeromin et al. fail to set forth a sustainable basis of disclosure of, *inter alia*, viscoelastic impact-absorbing material substantially confined to a respective corner.

So, the Examiner's use of Watanabe et al. ('490) and/or Jeromin et al. fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in each of Applicants' independent claims 1, 12, and 20.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not allege that the art of record provides any teaching, suggestion, or incentive for modifying the citation to Watanabe et al. ('490) and/or the citation to Jeromin et al. to provide the claimed configuration, assuming, *arguendo*, a modification of the citation to Watanabe et al. ('490) and/or the citation to Jeromin et al. would be proper.

For at least the reasons presented above, claims 1, 12, and 20 are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1, 12, and 20, as well as for their own additional characterizations

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-4, 8-12, and 14-21, and 23-31.

Applicant hereby authorizes charging of Deposit Account No. 07-0845 for any additional fees associated with entering the aforementioned claims.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert J. Brill/

Robert J. Brill
Registration No. 36,760
Direct Dial 773-832-4070
rjb@zpspatents.com

Dated: June 19, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.239

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170